

motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Minnesota is a good friend of mine, and I happen to be the only Republican in the Chamber. There is a Republican objection. I do not know who that Republican is, and I can maybe find out for the Senator. But I have to object for a Senator on my side, as long as I am in this position of being the only Republican Senator in this Chamber. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, just one more minute.

I say to my colleague from Iowa, I absolutely understand why he has to object. He is not speaking for himself. I know he is objecting on behalf of someone who is anonymous. I am positive the Senator from Iowa would be the first to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter, which is signed by AMVETS, the Disabled American Veterans, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which basically was addressed to Senator LOTT, saying, move this bill, take objections off, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 25, 2001.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LOTT: On behalf of the co-authors of The Independent Budget, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, we are writing to you, as Minority Leader, to urge you to work with your colleagues to remove holds that have been placed on two pieces of legislation that are important to our Nation's veterans.

These two measures, S. 1188, the "Department of Veterans Affairs Nurse Recruitment and Retention Enhancement Act of 2001" and S. 739, the "Heather French Henry Homeless Veterans Assistance Act," are vital pieces of legislation to the men and women who have served in our Armed Forces. With American servicemen and women on guard at home and abroad, we find it difficult to believe that some Senators are placing roadblocks and resorting to delaying tactics on passage of legislation of such great benefit to seriously disabled veterans who have also served their country with distinction. These measures have almost universal support. It is time that they be brought up, and voted upon.

We thank you, in advance, for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. VIOLANTE,
National Legislative
Director, Disabled
American Veterans.

RICHARD B. FULLER,
National Legislative
Director, Paralyzed

Veterans of America.
RICK JONES,
National Legislative
Director, AMVETS.
DENNIS CULLINAN,
National Legislative
Director, Veterans of
Foreign War.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Let me also say to my colleague from Iowa—and this is not aimed at him—as I have said, this is the third or fourth time I have come to the floor asking unanimous consent that we pass this legislation. I would appreciate it if whoever has an anonymous hold on this bill would be willing to step forward. But I want to make it crystal clear to the minority leader, and other colleagues, that I have a hold on every piece of legislation from the other side of the aisle that is not emergency legislation. I have a standing hold on all of your legislation.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I speak on another subject, I say to the Senator from Minnesota, I hope he knows my practice; when I put a hold on a piece of legislation or an individual, I put a statement in the RECORD as to why I have put on that hold, so you know that it is Senator GRASSLEY who has a hold on that item. I do not approve of Senators putting holds on legislation and not doing it that way. But, on the other hand, I am doing it for whoever that anonymous person is.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. I know that about him. And I say to the Senator from Iowa, with a twinkle in my eye, I am not putting any anonymous holds on any other legislation he is trying to move. I made it clear on the floor of the Senate, I am putting a hold on all of it unless it is absolutely an emergency.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

RESPONSE TO ATTACKS ON THE SENATE REPUBLICAN CAUCUS STIMULUS PLAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to this Chamber to address an issue that was discussed yesterday. I do it because I am the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee. I want to respond to some Senators on the other side of the aisle—meaning the majority side of the aisle—who have raised concerns about legislation that I have put forth as part of a stimulus package. I put forth this legislation for our Republican caucus in my capacity as former chairman and now

ranking member of the Finance Committee. So I want to respond, first, to the majority leader's and Budget Committee chairman's comments about the Senate Republican caucus proposal.

From my point of view, these comments were destructive of bipartisanship. The attacks came yesterday afternoon on the floor, following a news conference that was held on the Capitol grounds. In contrast, while these things were going on yesterday, I spent time working for an agreement that crossed party lines; in other words, for a bipartisan agreement.

In fact, for a number of weeks, the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, and I have been meeting in an attempt to find an agreement on a stimulus package.

Last week, Senator DASCHLE and Senator BAUCUS released a stimulus proposal that, as they indicated, clearly reflected the more liberal part of the Democratic caucus. Senator BAUCUS made it clear that it was basically a negotiating position and that he would be willing to move to the center.

The proposal was released as a position for the Democratic caucus. It was made very clear in statements, well-intentioned on the part of Senator BAUCUS, that it was basically a negotiating position and that he would be willing to move to the center, or saw that as necessary as part of the process to get legislation through the Senate.

In general, Republicans such as myself reacted constructively to the proposal. I was quoted in the press accordingly. I disagreed with the proposal Senator BAUCUS put forward, but I recognized it as an essential part of a process of getting a bill through the Senate. I saw it as a positive step. Quite frankly, I viewed it as a response to the bill that passed the House of Representatives.

On Tuesday of this week, we Republicans responded to the Democratic caucus position with one from our own caucus. From our point of view, it mirrored the President's stimulus plan. What kind of a reception did we get after we released our plan? In this era of bipartisanship and collegiality, something bad happened. The attack dogs were unleashed and with a fury. The same day, Senator DASCHLE harshly attacked our proposal in an extremely partisan, stilted manner.

The next afternoon, which was yesterday, Senator CONRAD was on the floor with the usual props he has—he uses them well—ferociously denouncing the Senate Republican proposal. Rather than recognizing the proposal as part of the process, as we Republicans viewed the Democratic proposal, the Democrats instead have turned up the partisan heat and are trying to torch any real plan that will help our economy and our country.

One has to wonder why we have such a double standard. Why is it that one

side obsessively attacks the other, that fact is not found on that side?

Senator DASCHLE, along with Senator LOTT, has exercised leadership since September 11. This had been a most important feature of doing business in Washington, DC, in these times of anxiety while we are trying to win the war on terrorism. The tone, as much as the substance, has been critical to the success of the process.

Senator DASCHLE himself said we should not be "strident" in these times of trying to win a war. So you can imagine my surprise, even anger, and surely disappointment, when I read the tone of Senator DASCHLE's attack on the plan and, frankly, on me in press reports. Basically, Senator DASCHLE accused me of unilaterally stopping the stimulus process, particularly as it related to Republicans and Democrats working out a bipartisan agreement.

I will read the quote into the RECORD:

We've waited in an effort to try and find a way to work in a bipartisan manner. Unfortunately, as a result of Grassley's decision yesterday . . . that will not be possible, at least in the short run . . .

I focus on Senator DASCHLE's quote because it is a bit ironic. As he was criticizing me, I was preparing for a meeting with Senator BAUCUS on the stimulus package. I guess if you ignore the fact that Democrats put out a partisan package last week, then Senator DASCHLE's quote would make some sense. But, of course, that is not true. So Senator DASCHLE seems to be saying that it is fine for Democrats to put out a caucus position and Republicans to be constructive, but if Republicans respond with our own caucus position, then that is partisanship. The Republican response justifies ramping up the content and the tone of the partisan rhetoric.

The American people expect better. They know a double standard when they see it. Let's get back to the tone Senator DASCHLE set earlier. That is what I am asking for; that is a very good tone.

Let's not descend to name calling, destructive partisan comments, and double standards.

Now I move to Senator CONRAD's attacks which occurred yesterday afternoon. Let me say, this is a preliminary response to Senator CONRAD's attack on the Senate Republican caucus plan. I will have a lot more to say on that later, particularly after I get some figures back from the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Senator CONRAD spent a lot of time yesterday developing charts that were critical of Senate Republican caucus positions which he personalized by calling it the Grassley plan. He personalized his attacks, and that should be avoided. He decided to appoint himself as the teacher and accordingly grade everyone's economic stimulus proposal. That is fine. He has that right. I

don't have a problem with that. If he is going to be the grader, though, I think he needs to be objective. He needs to treat those plans that he opposes the same way he treats those plans he supports. He does not do that.

The report card Senator CONRAD used yesterday is not the whole set of principles upon which the budgeteers agreed.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a copy of the budgeteers' documents.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCIPLES FOR ECONOMIC STIMULUS

The Chairmen and Ranking Members of the House and Senate Budget Committees recognize the extraordinary circumstances resulting from the September 11, 2001 attacks on our country. These terrorist attacks have created a national emergency, instigated a war on terrorism, and exacerbated a slowdown in the economy. Clearly, the Congress and the President will provide the resources necessary to respond to these events. The principles articulated below are simply intended to ensure that those resources provided by the Congress and the President be an effective economic stimulus package that does not erode fiscal discipline in the future.

Overall principle. An economic stimulus package should be based on the recognition that long-term fiscal discipline is essential to sustained economic growth. Measures to stimulate the economy should be limited in time so that as the economy recovers, the budget regains a surplus that is at least equal to the surplus in Social Security. Any short-term economic stimulus should not result in higher long-term interest rates.

Objectives. An economic stimulus package should restore consumer and business confidence, increase employment and investment, and help those most vulnerable in an economic downturn, and do all of the above without converting a cyclical deficit into a structural deficit.

Timing. Congress should assemble an economic stimulus package deliberately but with dispatch, aiming for passage within 3-4 weeks, based on the best economic data available.

Rapid impact. A substantial portion of the fiscal impact on the economy should be felt within 6 months.

Sunset. All economic stimulus proposals should sunset within 1 year, to the extent practicable.

Targets. Economic stimulus should be broad-based rather than industry-specific. Policies should achieve the greatest possible stimulus effect per dollar spent and should be directed to individuals who are most likely to spend the additional after-tax income and businesses most likely to increase investment spending and employment.

Size. The economic stimulus package should equal approximately 1 percent of GDP (about \$100 billion) but should count the budgetary effects of policies implemented since August, which, at present, total roughly \$40 billion.

Offsets. To uphold the policy of repaying the greatest amount of national debt feasible between 2002-2011, outyear offsets should make up over time for the cost of near-term economic stimulus.

Mr. GRASSLEY. If you compared the budgeteers' principles with the report

card Senator CONRAD generated, you will see, when you get a chance to read these, interestingly, that Senator CONRAD omits four of the nine principles. In other words, Senator CONRAD has selected five of the nine principles agreed on by budgeteers. Most importantly, Senator CONRAD didn't use the "overall principle," which reads:

An economic stimulus package should be based on the recognition that long-term fiscal discipline is essential to economic growth. Measures to stimulate the economy should be limited in time so that as the economy recovers, the budget regains a surplus that is at least equal to the surplus in Social Security. Any short-term economic stimulus should not result in higher long-term interest rates.

There is nothing in that comment with which I disagree. The point is, this principle is very important, and it ought to be followed. Senator CONRAD spent a lot of time dwelling on the rough 10-year revenue loss numbers of the Senate Republican and Senate Democratic plan. Senator CONRAD, however, left out an important assumption. I will explore the assumption Senator CONRAD left out.

As has been the case with all proposals from the Republican side, Chairman CONRAD has attacked the stimulus plan as, among other things, "fiscally irresponsible." Of course, I contest those unfounded and unfair criticisms. The plan is a straightforward proposal that will provide immediate economic stimulus. It will also give aid to dislocated workers, and it will help with their health insurance problems while being laid off, and it is fiscally reasonable. In fact, we have been in discussions with Senator BAUCUS's staff on these latter issues, such as dislocated workers and health insurance issues. So our plan follows on the President's four principles that were really the starting point of this debate first of all. That is what we ought to give President Bush credit for. He was presenting to the Congress the need for a stimulus package before many other people in Congress were even talking about the need for it.

Since his tenure as ranking member, and now chairman, of the Budget Committee, Senator CONRAD has placed all Republican tax cut proposals under very strict scrutiny. Senator CONRAD has assumed that any temporary tax cut, no matter the terms of the proposal, would be made permanent. The assumption was then incorporated into his budgetary analysis. Without fail, the conclusion is then used as a basis to argue that long-term budget implications of any temporary tax cut make it "fiscally irresponsible."

We have before us a Democratic caucus stimulus proposal that contains two elements. One element is a combination of tax cuts and new temporary entitlement spending. Another element of the proposal is Senator BYRD's \$20 billion "infrastructure package." The

two elements have been frequently mentioned by Democrat leadership, including Senators DASCHLE and REID, as the Senate Democratic position. When analyzed, these proposals are described as having a fiscal impact of \$90 billion in fiscal year 2002 and \$60 billion over 10 years.

Here is where you get into this double standard of scoring Republicans one way and Democrats another way. The scoring presented by the Democratic caucus, however, fails to employ Senator CONRAD's convention regarding permanency. They don't take that into consideration. If we apply Chairman CONRAD's convention to the new spending and assume permanency, the 10-year cost of the new spending package totals \$526 billion.

Think about it, Mr. President. In these times, Senator CONRAD has determined that it is fiscally responsible to spend an additional \$526 billion over 10 years. As a point of reference, this figure compares with the tax cuts of roughly \$175 billion in the Senate Republican caucus position.

I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the 10-year cost of the new spending in the Democratic caucus stimulus plan be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF SURPLUS IMPACT OF PERMANENT SENATE
DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS STIMULUS PROPOSALS
(In billions of dollars)

	FY 2002	FY 2002–11
1. Unemployment insurance: Additional 13 weeks and supplemental amount	–16	–71
2. 50% COBRA subsidy: Inflation at 8% per year	–10	–145
3. Medicaid expansion: Inflated using CBO August baseline	–7	–101
Total new entitlement spending	33	–317
New infrastructure appropriations: CBO estimate	20	–209
Total new spending	53	–526

Source: Republican Staff, Senate Budget Committee.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Under Chairman CONRAD's methodology, one of two conclusions is apparent from this exercise. One, if tax cuts and new spending are treated similarly, then under Chairman CONRAD's methodology, the Democratic caucus package is \$350 billion bigger than the Republican caucus package. That is a 2-to-1 ratio in favor of new spending. Alternatively, maybe Senator CONRAD is arguing that in scoring there should be a bias against tax cuts and in favor of new spending by assuming that new spending is temporary.

Since a key element of the budgeteers' principles was long-term budget effect, you would think Senator CONRAD would have more carefully considered the 10-year cost of new appropriations and new entitlements. It seems to me he graded these plans long before he analyzed them. How else can Senator CONRAD explain the laxity of the long-term spending effect?

Adding new appropriations and new entitlement spending to the budget, even if labeled temporary, brings a long-term budget cost. Otherwise, we are trying to kid people. When was the last time we cut the appropriations baseline or a new entitlement? It doesn't happen around here.

Now keep in mind that I have also asked the Joint Committee on Taxation to score the permanent effect of temporary tax cuts in each plan, but I do not have that analysis yet. I have had my staff work on it. They tell me it might narrow the gap some but would simply add to the total 10-year cost of each plan. Keep in mind that in making this comparison, I did not include the revenue loss of the Democratic caucus plan.

When former Senator Bradley left this body, he cited many reasons for leaving. One of the colorful references was to the deterioration of the level of floor debate. He referred to Senate debate as deteriorating to competing partisan cartoon-type characters endlessly talking past one another. Unfortunately, yesterday's attack charts seem to me to illustrate the deterioration of the respect to which Senator Bradley was referring.

A few months ago, the Washington Post reported approvingly of the Democratic leadership's message strategy. The article referred to a blackboard with a basic daily or weekly message. Apparently, yesterday's message was to attack a good-faith Republican caucus position and to attack me. I guess I say good job, or congratulations are in order, because the people who did it pulled off a well-coordinated attack.

What did such a harsh attack accomplish? When I go back to my farm this weekend, I imagine some of the folks back home might ask what the point of all that was. That is where I am, Mr. President. What is the point of this excessive partisan gamesmanship? What is the point of dumbing down the level of civility around here?

I say all these things in a constructive manner—from a person who just yesterday met with Senator BAUCUS to talk about a process of getting a stimulus package—hopefully, a bipartisan stimulus package—to the floor of the Senate. Although the transgressors in this case were Democrats, at times even my own Republicans have done the same thing. In this case, though, there really seems to be a Democratic rule book that includes a double standard.

So as one who practices bipartisan ship, I say to those who talk about it: Practice what you preach.

As I said, I will have more to say in a comprehensive way about some of Senator CONRAD's attacks on the specific pieces of the Senate Republican stimulus package.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH, AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2002—Continued

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, there have been very extensive discussions on the issue relating to stem cells, which is in the bill, relating to what President Bush did on August 9 using existing stem cell lines, in an effort to codify that and give the President authority to move in that direction. The stem cell issue has been very controversial for reasons which do not have to be amplified at this time.

A good bit of the debate on the subject has been between the Senator from Kansas, Mr. BROWNBACK, and myself. Senator BROWNBACK has posed a series of amendments, which he intends to bring up on this bill, of a very complex nature. The amendments Senator BROWNBACK has proposed to bring up involve the questions of the human germ line gene which I will not begin to explain at the moment, issues about therapeutic cloning, where science has given a name which suggests reproductive cloning, which it is not, but very complicated as to how it is worked out; amendments on the prohibition of the mixing of human and animal gametes where there has been some scientific thought that although very repugnant on its face, there are some important scientific issues involved.

One of the matters was submitted to the American Society for Reproductive Medicine, and they have not even taken a position on it, which shows the complexity of the issue.

Were we to proceed with these amendments, on which we have consulted with the Parliamentarian, who says they are germane because there is some sufficient—it does not require a whole lot to make them appropriate, and the Senator from Kansas has every right to bring them. I do not know how long it would take to debate them.

In the course of the past 2 days, we have talked about second-degree amendments, and we have talked about many subjects which are extraordinarily complicated. I have been trying to get up to speed to know what to say about them.

The concerns I have involve the issue of unintended consequences. That is a doctrine well-known in our culture. When one deals with these scientific issues, many scientists have told me it would stultify their activities, or at a minimum have a profoundly chilling effect.